

II. REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,839,708 (hereinafter *Boydston*), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028495 (hereinafter *Pallante*). It is well settled that in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites “the service request having a digital certificate attached.” The cited art fails to teach these limitations because *Pallante* teaches a traditional SSL handshake, such that even though *Pallante*’s system receives a digital certificate, this certificate is not attached to a request. The Examiner admits *Boydston* fails to teach these limitations and alleges *Pallante* paragraph [0065] teaches these limitations. Office Action p.4. The only statement regarding digital certificates within *Pallante* paragraph [0065] is that “public key certificates and cookies, may be downloaded onto user hosts to enable security services or state management.” Downloading certificates does not teach attaching certificates to a request at least because ‘attaching’ and ‘downloading’ are different operations. Additionally, *Pallante*’s system receives its certificate from the user after the web server requests the certificate from the user, as a part of the SSL handshake (*Pallante* para. [0141]), yet *Pallante* is silent to this certificate being attached to a service request. Hence, the cited art fails to teach “the service request having a digital certificate attached,” as set forth in the claim. Thus, the cited art fails to teach all elements of the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9

Claims 2-9 each depend from an inherit all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 contains features and limitations that are not taught by the cited art. Thus, claims

2-9 contain features and limitations that are not taught by the cited art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 10

Claim 10 recites “the service request having a digital certificate attached.” The cited art fails to teach these limitations because *Pallante* teaches a traditional SSL handshake, such that even though *Pallante's* system receives a digital certificate, this certificate is not attached to a request. The Examiner admits *Boydston* fails to teach these limitations and alleges *Pallante* paragraph [0065] teaches these limitations. Office Action p.4. The only statement regarding digital certificates within *Pallante* paragraph [0065] is that “public key certificates and cookies, may be downloaded onto user hosts to enable security services or state management.” Downloading certificates does not teach attaching certificates to a request at least because ‘attaching’ and ‘downloading’ are different operations. Additionally, *Pallante's* system receives its certificate from the user after the web server requests the certificate from the user, as a part of the SSL handshake (*Pallante* para. [0141]), yet *Pallante* is silent to this certificate being attached to a service request. Hence, the cited art fails to teach “the service request having a digital certificate attached,” as set forth in the claim. Thus, the cited art fails to teach all elements of the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 11-17

Claims 11-17 each depend from an inherit all the limitations of claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 contains features and limitations that are not taught by the cited art. Thus, claims 11-17 contain features and limitations that are not taught by the cited art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 18

Claim 18 recites “the service request having a digital certificate attached.” The cited art fails to teach these limitations because *Pallante* teaches a traditional SSL handshake, such that even though *Pallante's* system receives a digital certificate, this certificate is not attached to a request. The Examiner admits *Boydston* fails to teach these limitations and alleges *Pallante*

paragraph [0065] teaches these limitations. Office Action p.4. The only statement regarding digital certificates within *Pallante* paragraph [0065] is that “public key certificates and cookies, may be downloaded onto user hosts to enable security services or state management.” Downloading certificates does not teach attaching certificates to a request at least because ‘attaching’ and ‘downloading’ are different operations. Additionally, *Pallante*’s system receives its certificate from the user after the web server requests the certificate from the user, as a part of the SSL handshake (*Pallante* para. [0141]), yet *Pallante* is silent to this certificate being attached to a service request. Hence, the cited art fails to teach “the service request having a digital certificate attached,” as set forth in the claim. Thus, the cited art fails to teach all elements of the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.


Claims 19-24

Claims 19-24 each depend from an inherit all the limitations of claim 18. As discussed above, claim 18 contains features and limitations that are not taught by the cited art. Thus, claims 19-24 contain features and limitations that are not taught by the cited art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2800
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-231-4660
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com